



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

W
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 09/807,962 | 04/26/2001 | Paolo Peveralio | 205554US0PCT | 6663 |
| 1200 | 7590 | 07/22/2004 | EXAMINER | |
| AKIN, GUMP, STRAUSS, HAUER & FELD 1111 LOUISIANA STREET 44TH FLOOR HOUSTON, TX 77002 | | | SHAMEEM, GOLAM M | |
| | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER | |
| | | 1626 | | |

DATE MAILED: 07/22/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| | | | |
|------------------------------|------------------------|---------------------|--|
| Office Action Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
| | 09/807,962 | PEVARELLO ET AL. | |
| | Examiner | Art Unit | |
| | Golam M M Shameem | 1626 | |

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 March 2004.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-6,8 and 12-22 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) _____ is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) 1-6, 8 and 12-22 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
 6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

This office action supersedes the previous office action of November 24, 2003, which has been entered in the file. Therefore, Applicant's response to above office action is rendered moot in view of the present restriction requirements.

Claims 1-6, 8 and 12-22 are currently pending in the instant application.

Election/Restrictions

Restriction is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 and 372.

Lack of Unity Requirement

Restriction is based on PCT Rule 13.1, 13.2 and Annex B part 1(b) together with 37 CFR 1.475 and 1.499 for lacking unity of invention because of lacking a significant structural element qualifying as the special technical features.

Claims 1-6, 8 and 12-22 are drawn to more than one inventive concept (as defined by PCT Rule 13), and accordingly, a restriction is required according to the provision of PCT Rule 13.2.

PCT Rule 13.2 states that the international application shall relate to one invention only or to a group of inventions so linked as to form a single general inventive concept (requirement of unity of invention).

PCT Rule 13.2 states that unity of invention referred to in Rule 13.1 shall be fulfilled only when there is a technical relationship among those inventions involving one or more of the same or corresponding special technical features.

Annex B, Part 1(b), provides that "special technical features" mean those technical features, which as a whole define a contribution over the prior art.

Annex B, Part 1 (e), provides combinations of different categories of claims and states:

“The method for determining unity of invention under Rule 13 shall be construed as permitting, in particular, the inclusion of any one of the following combinations of claims of different categories in the same international application:

- (i) in addition to an independent claim for a given product, an independent claim for a process specially adapted for the manufacture of the said product, and an independent claim for a use of the said product, or
- (ii) in addition to an independent claim for a given process, an independent claim for an apparatus or means specifically designed for carrying out the said process, or
- (iii) in addition to an independent claim for a given product, an independent claim for a process specially adapted for the manufacture of the said product, and an independent claim for an apparatus or means specifically designed for carrying out the said process, . . .”

This application contains the following inventions or groups of inventions, which are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

In accordance with 37 CFR 1.499, applicant is required, in response to this action, to elect a single invention to which the claims must be restricted.

- I. Claims 1-5 drawn to a method of treating cell proliferative disorders classified in class 514, and plethora of subclasses.
- II. Claims 6, 8, 15-22 drawn to a compound classified in classes 548 and plethora of subclasses.
- III. Claims 12-14 drawn to a process for producing a compound classified in class 514, and plethora of subclasses.

Again, this list is not exhausted, as it would be impossible to group all the invention under the time constraints and due to the sheer volume of subject matters the instant application claimed. Therefore, applicant may choose to elect a single invention by identifying another specific embodiment not listed in the exemplary groups of the invention and examiner will

endeavor to group the same. If applicant wishes to elect subject matter other than that identified in the above groups, applicant may elect a species (compound) and Examiner will attempt to group it.

The inventions listed as Groups I-III do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, they lack the same or corresponding special technical features that define a contribution over the prior art. The invention Groups I-III outlined above each relate to a set of structurally diverse and dissimilar compounds, process of making and their method of uses which do not possess a substantial common core wherein a reference anticipating one would not necessarily render the other obvious. Accordingly, the unity of invention is considered to be lacking and restriction of the invention in accordance with the rules of unity of invention is considered to be proper.

This application contains claims directed to more than one compound of the generic invention. These species are deemed to lack unity of invention because they are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1. Applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single species (compound) to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. The reply must also identify the claims readable on the elected species, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered non-responsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after

the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02 (a).

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include an election of the invention to be examined even though the requirement is traversed (37 CFR 1.143). Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a petition under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

A telephone call was made to Mr. Charles Cox on July 14, 2004 to request an oral election to the above restriction requirement, but did not result in an election being made.

Applicants preserve their right to file a divisional on the non-elected subject matter.

Advisory of Rejoinder

The following is a recitation of M.P.E.P. 821.04, Rejoinder:

Where product and process claims drawn to independent and distinct inventions are presented in the same application, applicant may be called upon under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect claims to either the product or process. See MPEP § 806.05(f) and § 806.05(h). The claims to the nonelected invention will be withdrawn from further consideration under 37 CFR 1.142. See MPEP § 809.02(c) and § 821 through § 821.03. However, if applicant elects claims directed to the product, and a product claim is subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims, which depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be rejoined.

Where the application as originally filed discloses the product and the process for making and/or using the product, and only claims directed to the product are presented for examination, when a product claim is found allowable, applicant may present claims directed to the process of making and/or using the patentable product by way of amendment pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121. In view of the rejoinder procedure, and in order to expedite prosecution, applicants are encouraged to present such process claims, preferably as dependent claims, in the application at an early stage of prosecution. Process claims, which depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the patentable product, will be entered as a matter of right if the amendment is presented prior to final rejection or allowance. Amendments submitted after final rejections are governed by 37 CFR 1.116. Process claims, which do not depend from or otherwise include the limitations of the patentable product, will be withdrawn from consideration, via an election by original presentation (see MPEP § 821.03). Amendments submitted after allowance is governed by 37 CFR 1.312.

Process claims which depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed product claim and which meet the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103, and 112 may be entered.

Where product and process claims are presented in a single application and that application qualifies under the transitional restriction practice pursuant to 37 CFR 1.129(b), applicant may either: (A) elect the invention to be searched and examined and pay the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(s) and have the additional inventions searched and examined under 37 CFR 1.129(b)(2); or (B) elect the invention to be searched and examined and not pay the additional fee (37 CFR 1.129(b)(3)). Where no additional fee is paid, if the elected invention is directed to the product and the claims directed to the product are subsequently found patentable, process claims which either depend from or include all the limitations of the allowable product will be rejoined. If applicant chooses to pay the fees to have the additional inventions searched and examined pursuant to 37 CFR 1.129(b)(2) even if the product is found allowable, applicant would not be entitled to a refund of the fees paid under 37 CFR 1.129(b) by arguing that the process claims could have been rejoined. 37 CFR 1.26(a) states that “[T]he Commissioner may refund any fee paid by mistake or in excess of that required. A change of purpose after the payment of a fee...will not entitle a party to a refund of such fee...” In this case, the fees paid under 37 CFR 1.129(b) were not paid by mistake nor paid in excess, therefore, applicant would not be entitled to a refund. In the event of rejoinder, the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103, and 112. If the application containing the rejoined claims is not in condition for allowance, the subsequent Office action may be made final, or, if the application was already under final rejection, the next Office action may be an advisory action. Form paragraphs 8.42 through 8.44 should be used to notify applicant of the rejoinder of process claims, which depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowable product claim.

In the event of rejoinder, the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104 - 1.106. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103, and 112. If the application containing the rejoined claims is not in condition for allowance, the subsequent Office action may be made final, or, if the application was already under final rejection, the next Office action may be an advisory action.

The following is a recitation from paragraph five, “Guidance on Treatment of Product and Process Claims in light of *In re Ochoa*, *In re Brower* and 35 U.S.C. §103(b)” (1184 TMOG 86(March 26, 1996)):

“However, in the case of an elected product claim, rejoinder will be permitted when a product claim is found allowable and the withdrawn process claim **depends from or otherwise includes all the limitations of** an allowed product claim. Withdrawn process claims not commensurate in scope with an allowed product claim will not be rejoined.” (Emphasis added)

Therefore, in accordance with M.P.EP 821.04 and *In re Ochoa*, 71 F.3d 1565, 37 USPQ 1127 (Fed. Cir. 1995), rejoinder of product claims with process claims commensurate in scope with the allowed product claims will occur following a finding that the product claims are allowable. Until, such time, a restriction between product claims and process claims is deemed proper. Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy,

Applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution to maintain either dependency on the product claims or to otherwise include the limitations of the product claims. Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder.

Telephone Inquiry

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Golam Shameem, Ph.D. whose telephone number is (571) 272-0706. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 8:30 AM - 5:00 PM. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph McKane, can be reached at (571) 272-0699. The Unofficial fax phone number for this Group is (703) 308-7922. The Official fax phone numbers for this Group are (703) 308-4556 or 305-3592. When filing a FAX in Technology Center 1600, please indicate in the Header (upper right) "Official" for papers that are to be entered into the file, and "Unofficial" for draft documents and other communications with the PTO that are not for entry into the file of the application. This will expedite processing of your papers.

Communications via Internet e-mail regarding this application, other than those under 35 U.S.C. 132 or which otherwise require a signature, may be used by the applicant and should be addressed to [joseph.mckane@uspto.gov]. All Internet e-mail communications will be made of record in the application file. PTO employees will not communicate with applicant via Internet e-mail where sensitive data will be exchanged or where there exists a possibility that sensitive data could be identified unless there is of record an express waiver of the confidentiality requirements under 35 U.S.C. 122 by the applicant. See the Interim Internet Usage Policy

Art Unit: 1626

published by the Patent and Trademark Office Official Gazette on February 25, 1997 at 1195 OG
89.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist, whose telephone number is (571) 272-1600.



Golam M M Shameem, Ph.D.

Patent Examiner

Art Unit 1626, Group 1620

Technology Center 1

July 16, 2004